

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached sheets of drawings include:

Replacement sheet of Fig. 2 where a reference numeral 15 has been added; and

Replacement sheet of Fig. 6 where a reference numeral S21 has been added by replacing the original reference numeral S1.

Attachments:            Replacement Sheets containing Figs. 2 and 6.

## **REMARKS**

### **Claim Amendments**

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 6-9, 11, and 12, and canceled claims 2, 4, 5, and 10 without prejudice or disclaimer of their subject matter. The amendments to the claims are fully supported by the originally-filed application. For example, support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found in the specification at, for example, p. 18, line 20 to p. 19, line 16, p. 34, lines 16-21, p. 21, line 18 to p. 22, line 2, and p. 24, lines 1-6. No new matter has been introduced. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, 6-9, 11, and 12 are pending and under current examination.

### **Office Action**

The Office Action (1) objected to the drawings; (2) objected to the specification; (3) objected to claims 1, 4-8, 11, and 12; (4) rejected claims 2-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite; and (5) rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,047,069 (“Goodman”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,718,520 (“MacKay”).

### **Objection to the Drawings**

The Office Action objects to the drawings, Figs. 2 and 6 as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference signs mentioned in the description: “bus 15” for Fig. 2 and step “S21” for Fig. 6. *See* Office Action, p. 2. In response, Applicant has amended Figs. 2 and 6 to include the reference numerals “15” and “S21” respectively. No new matter has been added. Applicant files herewith 2 sheets of corrected drawings, each labeled “Replacement Sheet,” containing Figs. 2 and 6. Applicant respectfully submits that, in view of the amendments to Figs. 2 and 6, the objection to the drawings under

§ 1.84(p)(5) should be withdrawn. Applicant also requests that these replacement sheets of drawings be made of official record in the above-identified patent application.

**Objections to the Specification**

The Office Action objects to the title, because the title of the invention is allegedly not descriptive. *See* Office Action, p. 2. Although Applicant disagrees with the Office Action's characterization of the title, Applicant has amended the title to read "Image Forming Apparatus and Method for Remote Job Editing." Applicant respectfully submits that the amended title is descriptive, and the objection to the title should be withdrawn.

The Office Action also objects to the specification "for incompleteness and lack of clarity when setting forth examples of the prior art (see Specification [page 1, lines 7-8]) wherein examples of 'patent literatures 1 to 3' are neither completely nor clearly disclosed." *See* Office Action, p. 3. (Emphasis added). The Office Action further cites *In re Glass* and M.P.E.P. § 608.01(p) to support its objection. *Id.* Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office Action's characterization of the specification and traverses the objection.

Applicant submits that *In re Glass* is not applicable to the present application. In *In re Glass*, claims were unsupported by the specification because the specification was an inadequate, fatally defective disclosure, which would not enable any person skilled in the art to practice the invention defined in the claims. Therefore, the claims at issue in *In re Glass* did not meet the requirement set forth under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and were rejected under § 112, first paragraph. In contrast, the specification of the present application provides an adequate support for the claims of the present application, and the Office Action does not allege to the contrary. Instead, the Office Action refers to the discussion of patent literatures 1 to 3 (not the written

description of the claimed embodiments) in the Background section of the specification.

Therefore, *In re Glass* is not applicable to the present application.

Indeed, a specification should constitute a sufficient disclosure to enable a person skilled in the art to practice the claimed invention. To meet the requirement set forth under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, examples of the invention may be required to be set forth in the specification. However, neither *In re Glass* nor M.P.E.P. § 608.01(p) requires that examples of the prior art be set forth in the specification. Instead, M.P.E.P. § 608.01(p) states that “the prior art setting may be mentioned in general terms.”

In light of the foregoing discussion, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no legal basis for the Office Action to object to the specification due to a purported “incompleteness and lack of clarity” because “examples of ‘patent literatures 1 to 3’ are [allegedly] neither completely nor clearly disclosed.” *See* Office Action, p. 3. Applicant submits that the disclosure of the specification provides sufficient support for the claims, and is reasonably complete and clear. Applicant also submits that, the specification further includes discussions of several examples of prior art embodiments. *See, e.g.*, specification pp. 1-3. The patent literatures 1 to 3 are also cited in the Information Disclosure Statement concurrently filed herewith. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the specification.

The Office Action also objects to the abstract of the disclosure because of misspelling. *See* Office Action, p. 3. In response, Applicant has amended the abstract of the specification, and has attached herewith a new abstract labeled as “Replacement Abstract.” Applicant therefore respectfully requests the objection to the abstract be withdrawn.

In addition, the Office Action objects to the disclosure because of a typographical error on p. 28, lines 17-18. Accordingly, in response, Applicant has amended the specification as

suggested by the Office Action. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the objection to the disclosure be withdrawn.

### **Claim Objections**

The Office Action objects to claim 1 because of misspelling of the term “ticket.” *See* Office Action, p. 4. In response, Applicant has corrected the misspelling of the term “ticket” in claim 1.

The Office Action also objects to claims 4 and 5 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(a) as allegedly “failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention or discovery.” *See* Office Action, p. 4. Applicant submits that the objection to claims 4 and 5 is moot by virtue of the cancellation of these claims.

The Office Action also objects to claim 6 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(a) because claim 6 recites “a remote operation apparatus” in line 7 of the claim, while “a remote operation apparatus” has already been recited in line 6 of claim 1, from which claim 6 depends. *See* Office Action, p. 4. All claims dependent from claim 6 are also objected to. *Id.* In response, Applicant has amended claim 6 to correct the alleged informalities.

The Office Action also objects to claim 7 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(a) because claim 7 recites “a request for editing the job ticket” in line 2 and “a remote operation apparatus” in line 3 of the claim, while “a request for editing the job ticket” and “a remote operation apparatus” have already been respectively recited in line 9 of claim 6 and in line 6 of claim 1, from which claim 7 directly or indirectly depends. *See* Office Action, p. 5. In response, Applicant has amended claim 7 to correct the alleged informalities.

The Office Action also objects to claim 8 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(a) because claim 8 recites “a request for edition” in line 3 and “a remote operation apparatus” in line 4 of the claim, while

“a request for editing the job ticket” and “a remote operation apparatus” have already been respectively recited in line 9 of claim 6 and in line 6 of claim 1, from which claim 8 directly or indirectly depends. *See* Office Action, p. 5. In response, Applicant has amended claim 8 to correct the alleged informalities.

The Office Action also objects to claim 11 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(a) because claim 11 recites “a job ticket” in line 6 of the claim, while “a job ticket” has already been recited in line 3 of the claim. *See* Office Action, p. 5. All claims dependent from claim 6 are also objected to. *Id.* In response, Applicant has amended claim 11 to correct the alleged informalities.

The Office Action also objects to claim 12 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(a) because claim 12 recites “a request for editing the job ticket” and “a remote operation apparatus” in line 3 of the claim, while “a request for editing the job ticket” and “a remote operation apparatus” have already been recited in line 3 of claim 11, from which claim 12 depends. *See* Office Action, p. 6. In response, Applicant has amended claim 12 to correct the alleged informalities.

In light of the amendments to claims 1, 6-8, 11, and 12, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to these claims.

**Rejection of Claims 2-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 2-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. The rejection of claims 2, 4, 5, and 10 is moot by virtue of the cancellation of these claims.

The Office Action states that claim 6 “is rejected . . . as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationship of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections.” *See* Office Action, p. 6. The Office Action also states that the allegedly “omitted structural cooperative relationships are whether the storage of a

job ticket is directed toward the first job ticket or the second job ticket.” *Id.*, pp. 6-7. Although Applicant disagrees with the Office Action’s characterization of claim 6, Applicant has amended claim 6 and claim 1, from which claim 6 depends, to improve clarity of the recitation of the related features. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 6 is reasonably clear and precise, and therefore, the rejection of claim 6 should be withdrawn.

The Office Action alleges that claims 2, 8, and 10 are “incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships . . . [which] are whether the requests for editing and saving are directed toward the first job ticket or the second job ticket.” *See* Office Action, p. 7. The rejection of claims 2 and 10 is moot by virtue of the cancellation of these claims. Although Applicant disagrees with the Office Action’s characterization of claim 8, Applicant has amended claim 8 and claims 1 and 6, from which claim 8 depends, to improve clarity of the recitation of the related features. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 8 is reasonably clear and precise, and therefore, the rejection of claim 8 should be withdrawn.

The Office Action alleges that there is insufficient antecedent basis for “the other job ticket” recited in line 5 of claim 9 and “the mainframe operation section” recited in line 10 of claim 9. *See* Office Action, p. 7. In response, Applicant has amended claim 9 to delete the terms “other” and “mainframe.” Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 9 is reasonably clear and precise, and the rejection of claim 9 should be withdrawn.

**Rejection of Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Goodman and MacKay. The rejection of claims 2, 4, 5, and 10 is moot by virtue of their cancellation. Applicant respectfully traverses the remaining § 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 3, 6-

9, 11, and 12, because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claims 1, 3, 6-9, 11, and 12.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Office Action must, among other things, properly determine the scope and content of the prior art and properly ascertain the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2144.08(II)(A), 8th Ed., Rev. 6 (September 2007). Furthermore, the Office Action must make findings with respect to all of the claim limitations and must make “some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” *See* M.P.E.P. §§ 2143.03 and 2141(III).

Amended independent claim 1 recites, among other things, the following features:

- a storage section having a first job ticket storing area to store the job ticket capable of being edited by the operation section, and a second job ticket storing area to store the job ticket capable of being edited by the remote operation apparatus; and

- a control section configured to:

- prevent the operating section from editing the job ticket stored in the second job ticket storing area;

- allow the remote operation apparatus to edit ~~a second~~ the job ticket stored in the second job ticket storing area;

- control the image forming apparatus, when a request for editing the job ticket is received from the remote operation apparatus, in such a way as to read out the job ticket from the first job ticket storing area, and write the read job ticket into the second job ticket storing area; and

- control the image forming apparatus, when a request for saving the job ticket is received from the remote operation apparatus, in such a way as to read the job ticket edited by the remote operation apparatus from the second job ticket storing area, and write the read job ticket edited by the remote operation apparatus into the first job ticket storing area.



Goodman and MacKay, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the above features recited in amended claim 1. Goodman discloses “[a]n execution architecture, a development architecture and an operations architecture for a netcentric computing system.” Goodman, Abstract. Although Goodman teaches report and print services 138 in Fig. 6 and at col. 73, line 53 to col. 74, line 12, Goodman does not teach or suggest editing a job ticket in an image forming apparatus.

The Office Action alleges that Goodman teaches the claimed “control section” and references the “information services 64 [column 76, lines 49-58]” disclosed in Goodman, and alleges that the “information services 64 . . . allow the remote operation apparatus to edit the job ticket (see Fig. 7, document access services 170 [column 78, lines 3-5 and column 81, lines 21-29]).” Office Action, p. 8. However, contrary to the Office Action’s allegations, none of the places of Goodman referenced by the Office Action teaches or suggests “a control section configured to: prevent the operating section from editing the job ticket stored in the second job ticket storing area; [and] allow the remote operation apparatus to edit a second the job ticket stored in the second job ticket storing area,” as recited in amended claim 1. Goodman also does not teach or suggest that the control section is configured to “control the image forming apparatus, when a request for editing the job ticket is received from the remote operation apparatus, in such a way as to read out the job ticket from the first job ticket storing area, and write the read job ticket into the second job ticket storing area; and control the image forming apparatus, when a request for saving the job ticket is received from the remote operation apparatus, in such a way as to read the job ticket edited by the remote operation apparatus from the second job ticket storing area, and write the read job ticket edited by the remote operation apparatus into the first job ticket storing area,” as recited in amended claim 1. (Emphasis added).

Further, Goodman fails to teach or suggest the claimed “storage section having a first job ticket storing area to store the job ticket capable of being edited by the operation section, and a second job ticket storing area to store the job ticket capable of being edited by the remote operation apparatus,” as recited in amended claim 1.

The Office Action relies on MacKay to allegedly cure the deficiencies of Goodman. MacKay discloses an “apparatus for automatically modifying a print job ticket having a plurality of page tickets.” *See* MacKay, Abstract. MacKay, however, does not teach or suggest the claimed “storage section having a first job ticket storing area to store the job ticket capable of being edited by the operation section, and a second job ticket storing area to store the job ticket capable of being edited by the remote operation apparatus,” as recited in amended claim 1.

Furthermore, MacKay does not teach or suggest the claimed “control section.” The Office Action alleges that the “system control 54” and/or the “printer system control 128” correspond to the claimed “control section.” *See* Office Action, p. 9. However, neither the system control 54 nor the printer system control 128 is configured to “control the image forming apparatus, when a request for editing the job ticket is received from the remote operation apparatus, in such a way as to read out the job ticket from the first job ticket storing area, and write the read job ticket into the second job ticket storing area; and control the image forming apparatus, when a request for saving the job ticket is received from the remote operation apparatus, in such a way as to read the job ticket edited by the remote operation apparatus from the second job ticket storing area, and write the read job ticket edited by the remote operation apparatus into the first job ticket storing area,” as recited in amended claim 1. (Emphasis added).

For at least the foregoing reasons, Goodman and MacKay, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of amended independent claim 1. Moreover,

the undisclosed features represent significant differences between the claimed invention and the prior art. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established for claim 1, and it is allowable over the cited references.

Although of different scope, each of independent claims 9 and 11 recites features similar to those recited in claim 1, and thus, is allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Dependent claims 3, 6-8, and 12 are also allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1, as well as by virtue of reciting additional features not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 3, 6-9, 11, and 12.

**Regarding Honma and Haga**

The Office Action cites U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0134876 (“Honma”) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0146751 (“Haga”) and states that these two references are part of “[t]he prior art made of record and not relied upon [and are] pertinent to applicant’s disclosure.” *See* Office Action, p. 16. Applicant disagrees. Applicant submits that neither Honma nor Haga qualifies as prior art with respect to the present application. Honma was filed on August 25, 2004, and published on June 23, 2005, both dates being later than the U.S. filing date of the present application, March 15, 2004. Therefore, Honma does not qualify as prior art under §§ 102(a), (b), (e), or 103(a). Similarly, Haga was filed on September 21, 2004, and published on July 7, 2005, both dates being later than the U.S. filing date of the present application, March 15, 2004. Therefore, Haga also does not qualify as prior art under §§ 102(a), (b), (e), or 103(a).

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 29, 2009

By: /David W. Hill/  
David W. Hill  
Reg. No. 28,220  
(202) 408-4000